
From: Powers, David
To: Waye, Don
Sent: 2/27/2014 3:37:16 PM
Subject: RE: Great meeting in Tillamook

Thanks Don. I've appreciated your help and counsel over the years. Regarding 319 funding, one of the complications is that OR DEQ uses ~ half of the 319 dollars to pay for staff that develop TMDLs and TMDL implementation plans. I anticipate that if funding is reduced on-the-ground watershed work be curtailed before funding for TMDL staff is cut. Alan Henning will be a key person for you to stay in touch with. He is connected to on the ground 319 funded work and key state folks. Hasta Luego, Dave

From: Waye, Don
Sent: Thursday, February 27, 2014 11:51 AM
To: Powers, David
Subject: RE: Great meeting in Tillamook

Thanks for a great report, Dave! Glad things went so well.

I think the response to the Qs about how the "penalties" (a.k.a. withholdings) will impact the on-the-ground watershed restoration work these watershed councils are involved with is... once the withholding provision kicks in, the state will have discretion on which on-the-ground projects will go unfunded, and will retain enough grant funding to continue to work in its highest priority watersheds.

Saying you will be missed is a gross understatement. I hope our paths cross again—perhaps in the wilds of the Kenai peninsula. (I'll be the one in blaze orange so as to better avoid your crosshairs.)

From: Powers, David
Sent: Thursday, February 27, 2014 1:53 PM
To: Psyk, Christine; Waye, Don; allison.castellan@noaa.gov; Wu, Jennifer; Carlin, Jayne; Croxton, Dave; Henning, Alan
Cc: Opalski, Dan; Barber, Anthony
Subject: Great meeting in Tillamook

The OR CZARA presentation and discussion in Tillamook went extremely well (attch'd). We received positive feedback from a wide variety of participants...a county commissioner, the vice-chair of the OR EQC, federal and state agencies, watershed group members, and concerned citizens. Normal Tillamook watershed council meetings have less than a dozen people attending. There were 46 people at the meeting we attended, including three ex-county commissioners and one current one. They didn't all agree that NOAA and EPA should disapprove OR's NPS coastal program. but seemed to gain a better understanding of the remaining outstanding issues and why NOAA/EPA have proposed disapproval. And a number of people there did support disapproval given the longstanding nature of forestry issues in Oregon. The loss of funding to do watershed work was a key concern of several people at the meeting who also want changes to OR's FPA. Even some of the groups that will lose funding support disapproval. The timber industry was surprisingly quite/absent. I didn't see anyone that I knew from OFIC or the major timber companies. There were a few small private landowners there as well as an ex-county commissioner who is paid to attend watershed council meetings and report back to the timber industry.

Alan did a great job of setting the table with a CZARA program overview and explanation of outstanding issues. Thank you Don and Allison for your help in developing the CZARA overview ppt we used. We met with DEQ about the points that we hoped we could collectively make and took some of their input on ppt...I think it paid dividends. Both DEQ and EPA used the ppt for our presentations and we were pretty well in sync.

The majority of questions after our presentations were related to forestry and the effect of lost funding on good watershed work. General Ag questions and specific concerns about aerial herbicide spraying came up. Some questions about OR WQS and IR TMDLs, fish farm/hatchery impacts, erosion and large wood, gravel bars, and drinking water protection came up. I think we did a good job taking the wind out of the sails of some people who could have hijacked the discussion. The Tillamook Watershed Council facilitation helped too.

Several prior EPA discussions with DEQ on the main points we should collectively make were helpful. DEQ did not

make any statements about how OR's overall approach (land use requirements, voluntary restoration) should suffice for addressing outstanding OSDS, New Development, and Forestry MMs. DEQ's presentation also highlighted how DEQ and DLCD were making progress on OSDS/New Development MMs but that two other agencies, ODF and ODA, would be key to addressing outstanding ag and forestry issues.

One might chalk up my positive impressions **Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy** but would be mistaken. I talked to Greg Aldrich yesterday. He said that EQC vice-chair Ed Armstrong talked to Dick Pedersen and told him the presenters did a great job. Ed also was shaking his head yes during key discussion points: 1) there has been a consistent and growing body of science supporting the need for new MMs, 2) the fed agencies and state have continued to work together on CZARA and progress has been made over time, 3) the biological and habitat requirements for salmon make the West Coast CZARA efforts more challenging, and 4) the state and federal agencies want to continue working together towards full approval... He came up after the meeting and thanked us for doing a great job.

Hasta Luego, Dave

David Powers
Regional Manager for Forests and Rangelands
USEPA, Region 10
805 SW Broadway, Suite 500
Portland, OR 97205
powers.david@epa.gov
503-326-5874